

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/502,015

ART UNIT 1733  
Q82646

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Pursuant to the Examiner's requirement set forth in numbered paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, substitute Figs. 4A and 4B labelled as --Prior Art-- are submitted herewith.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet illustrating Figs. 4A - 4C

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are presently pending in this application.

As requested, corrected versions of Figs. 4A and 4B labeled as "Prior Art" are submitted herewith.

The Examiner objects to the specification because of the reference to claims in the disclosure of the Invention section from pages 4-14 of the specification. The foregoing amendments to the specification are believed to overcome this objection.

In addition, although not objected to by the Examiner, the Abstract is amended to be in single paragraph format as required by the rules of practice.

As for the indefiniteness rejection of claim 2 (see numbered paragraph 4 of the Office Action), the Examiner's suggested amendment is acceptable, and it is hereby adopted.

Claim 1 is hereby amended to recite (1) that the tread rubber, the side rubber and the side wall rubber are attached directly to the carcass, and (2) an interface between the side rubber and the side wall rubber is located entirely within a ground-contacting side of the tire to reduce bending deformation at the interface and prevent separation of the side rubber and the side wall rubber at the interface.

Support for feature (1) above can be found, by way of example, on page 8, lines 12-22 of the specification. Support for feature (2) above can be found, by way of example, on page 6, lines 3-23, and page 22, line 15 to page 23, line 9 of the specification. By employing the tire configuration as described by features (1) and (2) above, in addition to the fact that "physical properties or composition of the side wall rubber being the same as or similar to physical properties or composition of the side rubber" as presently recited in claim 1, separation of the side rubber and the side wall rubber from each other (i.e., the formation of cracks) at the interface therebetween can be prevented in the tire of claim 1. See the above cited portions of the

specification. With these amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the prior art rejections against the current claims are overcome.

The prior art rejections are respectfully traversed based on the foregoing amendment to claim 1 and the following additional remarks.

1. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Iwamura.

As shown in Fig. 1 of Iwamura, the interface between the wing rubber 11 and the upper side wall rubber  $S_g$  is at least partly located at a side surface of the tire where bending deformation is larger than at a ground-contacting side. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the interface is located entirely within the ground-contacting side to reduce bending deformation at the interface and prevent separation of the side rubber and the side wall rubber at the interface. This is a fundamental difference, and Iwamura is completely silent regarding this feature of the present invention.

Consequently, the configuration and effect of the respective tires in Iwamura and claim 1 are significantly different, and the tire of claim 1 is not taught nor fairly suggested by Iwamura.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rampl.

Based on the Examiner's reference to Figs. 3 and 4 of Rampl, it seems that the Examiner is equating the base layer or ply 1 to the claimed side rubber (28). However, Rampl clearly indicates at col. 9, lines 19-22 that "...tread member 16 comprises a doubled tread structure composed of a base layer or ply 1 and a profiled cap layer or ply 2." In contrast, claim 1 of the present application recites (as separate members) a tread rubber and a side rubber which is attached to the outer end portions of the tread rubber in a widthwise direction of the tire. Applicant respectfully submits that at least the side rubber feature in claim 1 is entirely missing from Rampl. In that regard, Rampl is no more pertinent than the background art described in the present application.

3. and 4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/§103(a) as being anticipated by/obvious in view of JP '101.

A rear tire Tr of JP '101 has a cap tread 1, a wing chip 6 and a side wall section 2 as shown in Fig. 1 on page 4 of the Japanese specification (see the drawing on the left side of page 4). However, the cap tread 1 is disposed on a carcass layer 3 via a belt layer 7 and a belt-cover layer 8 as described on page 2, lines 18-20 of the English specification and as shown in Fig. 1 of JP '101. In other words, the cap tread 1 is not directly attached to the carcass layer 3. Therefore, the configuration of the respective tires in JP '101 and claim 1 are not the same. In addition, a tire configuration in which the tread rubber is directly attached to the carcass is not suggested by JP '101. Moreover, since the tire of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by JP '101, the tire of claim 1 would not have been obvious even if the disclosures of JP '101 and Sievers could somehow have been combined.

5. and 6. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '101 in view of Sievers and Caretta, and claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '101 in view of Sievers and further in view of JP '444 or Takayanagi, and further in view of Caretta.

Since claims 3-5 recite production methods of the tire recited in claim 1, and since the subject tire is different from that of JP '101, each of the methods in current claims 3-5 would not have been obvious over JP '101 in view of Sievers, JP '444 and/or Caretta.

In summary then, all of the pending prior art rejections are believed to be overcome by the foregoing amendment to claim 1 and based on the above remarks. The Examiner is, therefore, respectfully requested to pass this application to issue at the earliest possible time.

If the Examiner feels that there any points remaining in issue that may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/502,015

ART UNIT 1733  
Q82646

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any over-payments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Gruskin  
Registration No. 36,818

**SUGHRUE MION, PLLC**  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 13, 2006